

Appl. No. 10/798,079  
Amdt. Dated September 16, 2010  
Reply to Office action of June 18, 2010

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### *35 U.S.C. §103*

Claims 98 – 104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent. No. 6,038,563 (“Bapat”) in view of several combinations as proposed by the Examiner. Claims 98 and 101 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Bapat in view of U.S. Patent. No. 5,956,715 (“Glasser”). Claim 99 stands rejected over Bapat in view of Glasser in further view of U.S. Patent. No. 6,298,445 (“Shostack”). Claim 100 stands rejected over Bapat in view of Glasser in further view of U.S. Patent. No. 6,321,337 (“Reshef”). Claims 102 – 104 stands rejected over Bapat in view of Glasser in further view of U.S. Patent. No. 6,405,318 (“Rowland”).

With respect to claim 98, the office action identifies three elements in the claim language “wherein transmitting the signal to the console includes using a dispatcher agent connected to the console over a peer-to-peer channel and transmission of the signal is platform independent.” To assert Bapat as teaching or suggesting “the dispatcher,” the Examiner relies on Fig. 5. Next, the office action refers to Fig. 8 for Applicant’s claimed “peer-to-peer channel.” The Examiner then cites back to Bapat’s discussion of Fig. 1 regarding a general network as reading on platform independence (Bapat, Col. 4:58 – 65). Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses.

Applicant submits Bapat fails to teach or suggest any of the three elements parsed out by the Examiner. The piecemeal rejection is clear evidence of an attempt at impermissible hindsight reconstruction. More importantly, Bapat’s comprehensive disclosure is not even sufficient for such a reconstruction.

Appl. No. 10/798,079  
Amdt. Dated September 16, 2010  
Reply to Office action of June 18, 2010

First, the office action relies on Fig. 5 of Bapat to teach or suggest "a dispatcher agent" as claimed. Fig. 5 shows a flow chart outlining the process of the access control decision function. According to Bapat, the access decision control function requires access requests to be processed in a strict sequential order. In fact, the requests of Bapat must be compared successively with a global deny rule, then a set of targeted deny rules, then a global grant rule and finally a set of targeted allow rules, in that order. (Bapat, Col. 11:59 – 62) In contrast, Applicant's console and dispatcher operate over a peer-to-peer channel where the console may update the rules with exceptions on the fly.

Not only does Bapat fail to teach or suggest connecting the console and dispatcher over a peer-to-peer channel, but Bapat's hard coded global deny and global grant rules teach away from Applicant's more dynamic technique when Applicant's claim is properly considered as a whole. Since it is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Next, the office action turns to Fig. 8 of Bapat to teach or suggest "a peer-to-peer channel. More specifically, the office action relies on Bapat's MIS to transmit event notification messages to specific users and entities. The existence of an MIS for transmitting event notifications to users and entities does not support reading Bapat as disclosing a peer-to-peer channel. In fact, it clearly teaches away as the MIS is a centralized control that maintains an event registry which holds user event requests in a table. In fact, the MIS directs all access requests whose specified operation type is "event notification" to the event registry, regardless of which objects are specified by the request. As such, Bapat's MIS not only fails to teach or suggest a peer-to-peer channel, but the centralized nature of Bapat's MIS teaches away from

Appl. No. 10/798,079  
Amdt. Dated September 16, 2010  
Reply to Office action of June 18, 2010

Applicant's claimed peer-to-peer channel. Since it is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection

Finally, the office action then routes back to the beginning of the Bapat reference where general networking principles are discussed. In order to support the assertion that Bapat teaches platform independence, the office action refers to Bapat's discussion of any network that uses management functions. When properly considered as a whole, the platform independence claimed by Applicant refers, *inter alia*, to the ability of Applicant's claimed technique to run on various operating systems. In contrast, Bapat is does not even mention operating systems. As such, Bapat fails to teach the platform independence as claimed.

In the interests of compact prosecution, Applicant submits the following amendment places the pending claims in condition for allowance. Without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicant amends claim 98 to recite the element "wherein the secure connection operates over a secure socket layer and the console and the listener agent are in cross-platform communication using simple object access protocol." Applicant submits the prior art of record, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest a console agent and listener agent in secure communication via an SSL connection. Furthermore, the Bapat reference teaches away from the dispatcher agent and peer-to-peer channel making any combination with the primary reference improper.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant believes the above is fully responsive to the examiner's concerns. Applicant further submits the rejection of the pending claims should be considered as no longer tenable

Appl. No. 10/798,079  
Amdt. Dated September 16, 2010  
Reply to Office action of June 18, 2010

with respect to the amended claims and should be withdrawn. Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully asked that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. Alternatively should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Law Offices of Peter S. Canelias

September 16, 2010

By: 

Peter S. Canelias  
Reg. No. 40,547  
Law Offices of Peter S. Canelias  
420 Lexington Avenue-Suite 300  
New York, NY 10170  
Tel: (212) 223-9654  
Fax: (212) 223-9651